REMARKS

The Office Action of April 20, 2007 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 3, and 29-42 have been amended. Claims 15-28 and 43-56 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 57-68 have been added. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-14, 29-42, and 57-68 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 12-22, 26-36, 40-50, and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,728,966 to Arsenault et al. (hereinafter "Arsenault"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other features, "a method for implementing an electronic program guide, the method comprising receiving programming information from a source, storing the received programming information, *in its entirety*, in a data storage area, responsive to storing the received programming information in its entirety, partitioning the data storage area into a plurality of discrete storage areas, and distributing stored programming information to each discrete storage area based on a predefined criterion." Applicants respectfully assert that Arsenault fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

Arsenault describes an electronic programming guide with a plurality of linked lists are used to remove redundancy, increase search speed and allow dynamic categories. Abstract. The system receives a stream of digitized data packets containing information and the packets are *filtered out* to remove any packets that are not currently of interest. Col. 6, lines 5-11. The packets that are of interest *may be intermediately stored* in system RAM. Col. 6, lines 11-28. Arsenault clearly fails to teach or suggest a method wherein received programming information is stored *in its entirety*. Rather, Arsenault describes a system and method wherein incoming data is sorted upon entry to determine what will be saved and what will be discarded.

Further, Arsenault fails to teach or suggest, responsive to storing the received programming information in its entirety, partitioning the data storage area into a plurality of discrete storage areas, and distributing stored programming information to each discrete storage

area based on a predefined criterion, as recited in claim 1. Even if it could be argued that Arsenault describes discrete storage areas, Arsenault clearly fails to teach or suggest partitioning the storage area *responsive to* storing the programming information *in its entirety*. In fact, Arsenault teaches away from such an arrangement because the incoming data of Arsenault is sorted and filtered prior to being saved. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is allowable over Arsenault.

Amended claim 29 recites language similar to that of amended claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and further in view of the additional novel features recited therein.

Claims 2-8 and 12-14 that depend from claim 1, and claims 30-36 and 40-42 that depend from claim 29, are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above, and further in view of the additional novel features recited therein. For example, claims 3 and 31 recite, among other features, programming information further comprising tokens, including *compressed forms* of the information about the individual programs, used to describe individual programs and a meaning associated with the tokens. Arsenault fails to teach or suggest this feature.

Arsenault describes content records that are accompanied by a title and a label. Col. 6, lines 55-63. Arsenault fails to teach or suggest tokens that include *compressed forms* of information about individual programs. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of a *meaning* associated with the tokens. Rather, the records of Arsenault include a title and a label. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3 and 31 are allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 15-22, 26-28, 43-50, and 54-56 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering these rejections moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-11, 23-25, 37-39, and 51-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arsenault in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,155,831 to Emma et al. (hereinafter "Emma"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Appln. No.: 10/071,091

Amendment dated October 22, 2007

Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2007

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 1, and claims 37-39 depend from claim 29, and are

allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. The addition of Emma

fails to cure the deficiencies of Arsenault with respect to claims 1 and 29. For instance, Emma

fails to teach or suggest a method wherein received programming information is stored in its

entirety. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 9-11 and 37-39 are allowable

over the cited combination of references.

Claims 23-25 and 51-53 have been cancelled, thereby rendering these rejections moot.

New Claims

New claims 57-68 have been added. Support for these claims can be found throughout

the specification. For example, support for claims 57-68 can be found at least at paragraphs

0021-0024 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

Page 13 of 14

Appln. No.: 10/071,091

Amendment dated October 22, 2007

Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2007

CONCLUSION

The Commissioner is authorized to charge our deposit account number 19-0733 in the

amount of \$1020 for a three month extension. No additional fees are believed to be due in

connection with this amendment. If any additional fees are required or if an overpayment is

made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733,

accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant

application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 22, 2007

By: /Elizabeth A. Almeter/

Elizabeth A. Almeter

Registration No. 57,019

1100 13th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

Tel: Fax: (202) 824-3000 (202) 824-3001

Page 14 of 14